

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 1, 3-6, 8-20, 40-44 and 45 are allowed.


Remaining claims 21-39 and 41-43 stand rejected. In the “Response to Arguments” section, the Examiner notes that Applicants’ previously argued that the claimed limitation “internal” means “on chip” but that the claims should be amended accordingly. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims must be read in light of the specification and must be interpreted to be consistent with Applicants’ disclosure. The term “internal” does not appear to have been given any meaning since the cited references do not describe the claimed subject matter. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to include the inherent wording of “on chip” as it appears to be a preferred term by the Examiner. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims have not been amended to include any limitation that was not inherently in the claims as originally filed. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the allowable claims include the term “internal” and apparently was given the meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

In any event, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Melo et al. reference nor the Brickford et al. reference teach or suggest the claimed subject matter as admitted in the “Response to Arguments” section of the office action and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance. By way of example, Melo does not disclose any internal bus bridge or internal I/O circuit that prevents signals from any external circuit from reaching the internal circuit as claimed and to the contrary, the structure 12 in Melo is actually a separate processor from the Northbridge 14 and Southbridge 28 which all appear to be external to one another as in conventional systems.

Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks in the previous action and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants also respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/26/05

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003
312/609-7500
312/609-5005 Facsimile